arXiv:quant-ph/0405032v2 6 Jun 2004

Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma in the new representation

Jinshan Wu
Department of Physics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C. Canada, V5A 1S6

February 1, 2008

Abstract

Using the representation introduced in our another paper[1], the well-known Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma proposed in [2], is reexpressed and calculated. By this example and the works in [1] on classical games and Quantum Penny Flip game, which first proposed in [3], we show that our new representation can be a general framework for games originally in different forms.

Key Words: Quantum Game Theory, Prisoner's Dilemma

Pacs: 02.50.Le, 03.67.-a

Introduction — Recently, we proposed a new mathematical representation[1] for Classical and Quantum Game Theory. It has been shown than N-player classical games, which are traditionally defined by N single-player strategy sets and $(0,N)$-tensor payoff functions, can be equivalently reexpressed in the new representation, by a system strategy space and N $(1,1)$-tensor payoff functions. In the same paper, the well-known Quantum Penny Flip game[3] has also been rewritten by the new language. In another paper[5], we apply the new representation onto Battle of the Sexes and get some interesting results such as entangled strategy equilibrium state. Although our new representation is defined as an abstract form, which is believed be able to describe any specific games, it seems still necessary to discuss more famous games as examples by this new language. So in this paper, we try to describe in the new representation a well-known game proposed in [2], the Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma.

The original Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma — First, we follow the definition in [2], but reexpress it in density matrix form instead of the original state vector form, and give the manipulative definition proposed in [6],

$$\Gamma^{q,o}=\left(\rho_0^q\in\mathbb{H}^q,\prod_{i=1}^{N}\otimes\mathbb{H}^i,\mathcal{L},\left\{P^i\right\}\right). \tag{1}$$

A two-particle quantum system is used as the quantum object in the game, which has the Hilbert space formed by base vectors $|UU\rangle, |UD\rangle, |DU\rangle, |DD\rangle$. Here $|UU\rangle$ represents the state that particle 1 and particle 2 stay on $|U\rangle$. We also suppose they

are distinguishable, named 1 and 2 respectively. The initial state of the quantum object is

$$\rho_0^q = |UU\rangle \langle UU| = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

A typical strategy players can use is

$$\hat{U}(\theta, \phi) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\phi}\cos\theta/2 & \sin\theta/2 \\ -\sin\theta/2 & e^{-i\phi}\cos\theta/2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

So player 1's strategy space is the above unitary operator acting on particle 1, and similarly for player 2. The payoff value is determined by

$$E^i = Tr\left(G^i \left(\hat{U}^1 \otimes \hat{U}^2\right) \rho_0 \left(\hat{U}^1 \otimes \hat{U}^2\right)^\dagger\right), \tag{4}$$

in which, if defined in the base vectors above, the payoff scale matrix P^i is

$$P^1 = \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P^2 = \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5}$$

So mapping $\mathcal{L}\left(\hat{U}^1, \hat{U}^2\right) = \hat{U}^1 \otimes \hat{U}^2$. Classical pure strategies are

$$N^c = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad F^c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

If players can only use classical strategies, we can check that the payoff from equ(4) equal to the classical payoff defined as

$$G^{1,c} = \begin{bmatrix} r & s \\ t & p \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad G^{2,c} = \begin{bmatrix} r & t \\ s & p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{7}$$

For example, we check the situation when both the two players choose N^c. N^c acting on $|U\rangle$ gives $|U\rangle$, so the end state of the quantum object is still $|UU\rangle$. So the first elements of $G^{1,c}$ and $G^{2,c}$ are r and r.

Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma in the new representation — Now we try to derive the abstract form[1, 6],

$$\Gamma^q = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{N} \otimes S_i^q, \left\{H^i\right\}\right). \tag{8}$$

The central idea of our new representation is to find a set of base vectors for strategy, and to defined inner product between them so as to form them as a Hilbert space. And then redefined payoff function as a mapping from the system strategy space to real

number. Here, we have four good and natural base strategies. Besides the two classical pure strategies in equ(6), we still have

$$N^q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad F^q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

which we named as quantum base strategies. A general quantum strategy in equ(3) can be expanded as

$$\hat{U}(\theta, \phi) = \cos\frac{\theta}{2}\cos\phi N^c + i\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\sin\phi N^q + i\sin\frac{\theta}{2}F^q. \tag{10}$$

A more general operator can be

$$\hat{U} = \xi \cdot N^c + x \cdot F^c + y \cdot F^q + z \cdot N^q, (\xi, x, y, z \in \mathbb{C}). \tag{11}$$

Or if we require s is unitary, in a set of independent parameters[4],

$$\hat{U} = \cos\frac{\gamma}{2}\cos\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}N^c - i\sin\frac{\gamma}{2}\sin\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}F^c - i\sin\frac{\gamma}{2}\cos\frac{\alpha-\beta}{2}F^q - i\cos\frac{\gamma}{2}\sin\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}N^q. \tag{12}$$

The inner product is defined as

$$\left(s, s^{'}\right) = \frac{Tr\left(s^{\dagger}s^{'}\right)}{Tr(I)}. \tag{13}$$

Then (N^c, F^c, N^q, F^q) are orthogonal and normalized. Later on we denote them as base vectors such as $|N^c\rangle$. A system strategy space is the direct product space of the two players, so it has 16 base vectors such as $|N^c, N^c\rangle$. A state in the system strategy space can be

$$|S\rangle = \left|s^1, s^2\right\rangle. \tag{14}$$

Now we try to define $(1,1)$-tensor payoff matrix H^i so that

$$E^i(S) = \langle S| H^i |S\rangle, \forall S. \tag{15}$$

In [1], a general procedure has been proposed, that first to define its elements on a specific set of base vectors, then prove it can be used for any states. Now elements of the payoff matrix is defined

$$H^i_{\alpha\beta} = \langle\alpha| H^i |\beta\rangle = \left\langle\alpha^1, \alpha^2\right| H^i \left|\beta^1, \beta^2\right\rangle = Tr\left(P^i\left(\beta^1 \otimes \beta^2\right)\rho_0\left(\alpha^1 \otimes \alpha^2\right)^{\dagger}\right), \tag{16}$$

in which α^i, β^i are anyone of the predefined base vectors (N^c, F^c, N^q, F^q). Before we calculate all the values of the elements, we need to prove the definition in equ(16) guarantee equ(15) is valid for any strategy.

Theorem Suppose $|S\rangle = \left|s^1, s^2\right\rangle$, $\forall s^1, s^2$, for the payoff matrix H^i defined in equ(16), prove that $E^i(S) = Tr\left(P^i\left(s^1 \otimes s^2\right)\rho_0\left(s^1 \otimes s^2\right)^{\dagger}\right)$ equals $\langle S| H^i |S\rangle = \left\langle s^1, s^2\right| H^i \left|s^1, s^2\right\rangle$.

Proof If s^1, s^2 are the base vectors, this is just the definition of H^i. So it's obvious. We claim that $\left(s^1 \otimes s^2\right)^\dagger = \left(s^1\right)^\dagger \otimes \left(s^2\right)^\dagger$, $x_\alpha \cdot s^1_\alpha \otimes y_\nu \cdot s^2_\nu = x_\alpha y_\nu \cdot s^1_\alpha \otimes s^2_\nu$ and $\left(s^1_\alpha + s^1_\beta\right) \otimes \left(s^2_\mu + s^2_\nu\right) = s^1_\alpha \otimes s^2_\mu + s^2_\beta \otimes s^2_\mu + s^1_\alpha \otimes s^2_\nu + s^1_\beta \otimes s^2_\nu$. The proof of a general strategy S will need all of these relations, which are easy to check. Now we suppose $s^i = \sum_\mu x^i_\mu \left|\mu\right\rangle$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
Tr\left(P^i\left(s^1 \otimes s^2\right)\rho_0\left(s^1 \otimes s^2\right)^\dagger\right) &= Tr\left(P^i\left(s^1 \otimes s^2\right)\rho_0\left(s^1\right)^\dagger \otimes \left(s^2\right)^\dagger\right) \\
&= Tr\left(P^i \sum_{\mu,\nu} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \mu \otimes \nu \rho_0 \left(\sum_\xi x^1_\xi \xi\right)^\dagger \otimes \left(\sum_\eta x^2_\eta \eta\right)^\dagger\right) \\
&= Tr\left(P^i \sum_{\mu,\nu} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \mu \otimes \nu \rho_0 \sum_{\xi,\eta} \bar{x}^1_\xi \bar{x}^2_\eta \xi^\dagger \otimes \eta^\dagger\right) \\
&= Tr\left(P^i \sum_{\mu,\nu,\xi,\eta} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \bar{x}^1_\xi \bar{x}^2_\eta \mu \otimes \nu \rho_0 \xi^\dagger \otimes \eta^\dagger\right) \\
&= \sum_{\mu,\nu,\xi,\eta} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \bar{x}^1_\xi \bar{x}^2_\eta Tr\left(P^i \mu \otimes \nu \rho_0 \xi^\dagger \otimes \eta^\dagger\right) \\
&= \sum_{\mu,\nu,\xi,\eta} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \bar{x}^1_\xi \bar{x}^2_\eta \left\langle \xi, \eta \left| H \right| \mu, \nu \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle S\right| H^i \left|S\right\rangle &= \left\langle s^1, s^2\right| H^i \left|s^1, s^2\right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\xi,\eta} \bar{x}^1_\xi \bar{x}^2_\eta \left\langle \xi \left| \left\langle \eta \right| H \sum_{\mu,\nu} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \right| \mu \right\rangle \right| \nu \right\rangle \\
&= \sum_{\mu,\nu,\xi,\eta} x^1_\mu x^2_\nu \bar{x}^1_\xi \bar{x}^2_\eta \left\langle \xi, \eta \left| H \right| \mu, \nu \right\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

So they are equal, and we get equ(15). The payoff matrix H^1, H^2 in the base vectors (N^c, F^c, N^q, F^q) are

$$H^1 = \begin{bmatrix}
r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & s & 0 & is & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & s & 0 & is & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -is & 0 & s & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -is & 0 & s & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & t & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & it & 0 & it & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & ip & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & ip & 0 & -p \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & t & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & it & 0 & it & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -ip & 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & ip \\
r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & s & 0 & is & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & s & 0 & is & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r & 0 & r & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -is & 0 & s & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -is & 0 & s & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -it & 0 & -it & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & t & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -ip & 0 & p & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & p & 0 & ip \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -it & 0 & -it & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & t & 0 & t & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -p & 0 & -ip & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -ip & 0 & p
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

and

$$H^2 = H^1\left(t \rightleftarrows s\right). \tag{18}$$

For classical game, the base vectors are only N^c, F^c, then the sub-matrix are

$$H^{1,c} = \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad H^{2,c} = \begin{bmatrix} r & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & p \end{bmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

They are equivalent with the payoff matrix directly reexpressed into our new representation from $G^{1,c}, G^{2,c}$.

Density matrix form of the game — For a quantum system state, equ(15) can be used to calculated the payoff value. But a classical mixture strategy with probability p^i_{nc} on N^c and p^i_{fc} on F^c is impossible to rewritten as the vector form as equ(11). In order to compare quantum strategy with classical strategy, we have to define a more general strategy form. In [1], a density matrix form is used, such as

$$\rho^{S,c} = \left(p^1_{nc} \left|N^c\right\rangle \left\langle N^c\right| + p^1_{nc} \left|N^c\right\rangle \left\langle N^c\right|\right) \left(p^2_{nc} \left|N^c\right\rangle \left\langle N^c\right| + p^2_{nc} \left|N^c\right\rangle \left\langle N^c\right|\right).$$

In fact, this density matrix form can be applied onto both classical and quantum strategies. So quantum mixture strategy is permitted to use by a quantum player. Then the payoff value equ(15) turns into a density matrix form,

$$E^i = Tr\left(\rho^S H^i\right). \tag{20}$$

Now our classical and quantum Prisoner's Dilemma is redefined as

$$\Gamma^q = \left(S^{1,q} \otimes S^{2,q}, \left(H^{1,q}, H^{2,q}\right)\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^c = \left(S^{1,c} \otimes S^{2,c}, \left(H^{1,c}, H^{2,c}\right)\right). \tag{21}$$

The classical game is defined in a subspace of the quantum game, and the classical payoff matrix is the sub-matrix on the subspace.

Equilibrium state of the game — Now we have shown that our language can be used to discuss this game. Although calculation of NE and a general algorithm is not the main topic of this paper, finding some solutions and comparing them with the solutions given in their original frameworks is quite attractive. In [5], Nash Equilibrium is redefined and a Global Equilibrium State (GES) is proposed. And in [2], a Pareto optimal state $\left(\hat{U}\left(0, \pi/2\right), \hat{U}\left(0, \pi/2\right)\right)$ is found. Now we try to check if there is a GES, if not, if there is some other state which can be used to beat the Parato optimal strategy. A Nash Equilibrium State ρ^S_{eq} is defined as

$$E^i\left(\rho^s_{eq}\right) \geq E^i\left(Tr^i\left(\rho^s_{eq}\right) \cdot \rho^i\right), \forall i, \forall \rho^i, \tag{22}$$

in which $Tr^i\left(\cdot\right)$ means to do the trace in player i's strategy space. If system state is a direct product of all single-player states,

$$\left(\rho^s_{eq}\right) = \prod_i \rho^i_{eq} \tag{23}$$

then definition in equ(22) is equivalent with traditional NE,

$$E^i\left(\rho_{eq}^s\right) \geq E^i\left(\rho_{eq}^1 \cdots \rho^i \cdots \rho_{eq}^N\right), \forall i, \forall \rho^i. \tag{24}$$

A special case of the first definition is

$$E^i\left(\rho_{eq,m}^s\right) \geq E^i\left(\rho^s\right), \forall \rho^s, \forall i. \tag{25}$$

Although it is not always possible to find such a state $\rho_{eq,m}^S$, if the game has one such state then it is a dominant strategy, so we named it GES[5]. The reduced payoff matrix H_R^i is the reduced matrix of H^i when all other players' strategies are fixed,

$$H_R^i = Tr_{-i}(\rho^1 \cdots \rho^{i-1}\rho^{i+1} \cdots \rho^N H^i), \tag{26}$$

where $Tr_{-i}(\cdot)$ means to do the trace in the space except player i's space.

If both H^1 and H^2 have a common eigenvector, which has the maximum eigenvalue in both the two payoff matrix, then this state is a GES. It's probably an entangled strategy state like the one of the game in [5]. Here we check if such state exists in this game. Both H^1 and H^2 have eigenvalues $4s, 4r, 4p, 4t$ and other 12 zeros. The corresponding eigenvector $|4t\rangle^1 \neq |4t\rangle^2$ and $|4s\rangle^1 \neq |4s\rangle^2$, but $|4r\rangle^1 = |4r\rangle^2$ and $|4p\rangle^1 = |4p\rangle^2$. When $t > r > p > s$, there is no GES, but $|S_m\rangle = |4r\rangle^1 = |4r\rangle^2$ are the system state with second-maximum eigenvalue, on which both player 1 and player 2 get $4r$. The vector form of $|S_m\rangle$ is

$$|S_m\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\left(|N^cN^c\rangle + |N^cN^q\rangle + |N^qN^c\rangle + |N^qN^q\rangle\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(|N^c\rangle + |N^q\rangle\right)\left(|N^c\rangle + |N^q\rangle\right),$$

or transfer it back into matrix form

$$S_m = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

So S_m is not a unitary operator, although it leads to higher payoff, it might be unapplicable. And even it's applicable, it's not a NE. Because, player i can get more payoff by adjust its own strategy. The role of such system state is that everyone knows it's not a best choice, but a good choice if both players can keep staying on such state, just like the $|N^cN^c\rangle$ state in classical prisoner's dilemma. Leaving from such state will at least decrease the payoff of one player. Also state $|4p\rangle^1 = |4p\rangle^1$ has such similar property.

Now we discuss the reduced payoff matrix when player 2 or 1 choose $\hat{U}(\theta_2, \phi_2)$. From equ(26),

$$H_R^1 = \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_1 & 0 & \epsilon_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon_2 & 0 & i\epsilon_2 \\ \epsilon_1 & 0 & \epsilon_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -i\epsilon_2 & 0 & \epsilon_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{27}$$

in which $\epsilon_1 = s\sin^2\frac{1}{2}\theta_2 + r\cos^2\frac{1}{2}\theta_2, \epsilon_2 = p\sin^2\frac{1}{2}\theta_2 + t\cos^2\frac{1}{2}\theta_2$. It has eigenvalues $\{2\epsilon_2, 2\epsilon_1, 0, 0\}$. When $t > r > p > s$, the $2\epsilon_2$ is the maximum eigenvalue for any θ_2. The corresponding eigenvector is $(0, i, 0, 1)^T$, or in matrix form,

$$s_m^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{2}i & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which is obviously not a unitary matrix. Although it leads to higher payoff, it's not applicable. The same situation happens to player 2, so the payoff value of the both players will be $4p$. So non-unitary operators space gives a new NE, $\left|E^1 = 4p = E^2\right\rangle$.

Now we limit out strategies in unitary operator space. For a general unitary operator strategy $\hat{U}(\theta_1, \phi_1)$, the payoff of player i is

$$E^i = \left(t\cos^2\frac{\theta_{(3-i)}}{2} + p\sin^2\frac{\theta_{(3-i)}}{2}\right)\sin^2\frac{\theta_i}{2} + \left(r\cos^2\frac{\theta_{(3-i)}}{2} + s\sin^2\frac{\theta_{(3-i)}}{2}\right)\cos^2\frac{\theta_i}{2}. \tag{28}$$

Since the first term is larger, the best response is $\theta_1 = \pi$. Similarly, when player 1 is fixed at $\hat{U}(\theta_1, \phi_1)$. the best response of player 2 is $\hat{U}(\pi, \phi_2) = iF^q$. Therefor, the NE in quantum unitary strategy is

$$|S\rangle = \left|E^1 = p, E^2 = p\right\rangle = \left(i\left|F^q\right\rangle i\left|F^q\right\rangle\right). \tag{29}$$

However, this NE strongly depends on equ(3), because we have more unitary operators. In the whole unitary operator space defined by equ(12), with the parameters α, β, γ, the payoff of player i is still in the form of equ(28), in which θ_i is replaced with γ_i. So it's still independent of α, β. Therefor, NE in this whole unitary operator space is

$$\left|E^1 = p, E^2 = p\right\rangle = \left|\hat{U}(\gamma = \pi, \alpha_1, \beta_1), \hat{U}(\gamma = \pi, \alpha_2, \beta_2)\right\rangle, \tag{30}$$

where in operator form,

$$\hat{U}(\gamma = \pi, \alpha_1, \beta_1) = -i\sin\frac{\alpha - \beta}{2}F^c + i\sin\frac{\alpha + \beta}{2}F^q. \tag{31}$$

So for our Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma, the payoff from Quantum Nash Equilibrium is the same with the payoff from original Classical Nash Equilibrium. In this sense, we say the quantization does not solve the dilemma, although instead of only one NE in classical case, here the quantized game has more NEs ($\forall\alpha, \beta$). But if non-unitary operators are applicable, we will have better NEs, such as $\left|E^1 = 4p = E^2\right\rangle$ and $\left|E^1 = 4r = E^2\right\rangle$. And further more, if entangled states are permitted, the former NEs will not be NEs anymore. In some cases, even GES can be found[5]. Usually, such GES will not be a direct product state, so it includes correlation between players. This property looks like cooperative behavior. Although this game has no GES, it's still probably to find general NE as equ(22) in this entangled strategy space. Unfortunately, we have no applicable algorithm for such general NE. But if we can find them, it will probably have bigger payoff and also be unitary in the system space. Then, we can say, a general

NE in entangled strategy space solves the dilemma. However, of course, since it't not a direct product state, it implies that something like negotiation and agreement are the real reason to solve the dilemma. Anyway, even that, it's a good news, which means our representation is hopefully a way from non-cooperative game to cooperative game.

Conclusion — Now we see the new representation can be applied onto the Quantum Prisoner's Dilemma. In classical strategy space, it gives the same result with traditional language, $\left|E^1 = p = E^2\right\rangle$; in quantum unitary operator strategy space, some new NEs, which have the same payoff with classical NE, appears, $\left|E^1 = p = E^2\right\rangle$; in general quantum strategy space including non-unitary operators, two new NEs appear in such game, $\left|E^1 = 4p = E^2\right\rangle$ and $\left|E^1 = 4r = E^2\right\rangle$, but they are non-unitary operators; and at last, if entangled strategy is permitted, the game here has no GES, but still probably has NE. Unfortunately, now we have no way to get such NE. The existence of NE in such strategy space calls more investigation. In fact, the definition proposed here is for general NE in any strategy space, but without a proof of the existence and no applicable algorithm. And frankly, we even have no idea if such general NE is meaningful or not, because it requires non-direct-product state and/or non-unitary operator. However, the point is no matter whether they have applicable meaning or not, questions in Game Theory can be discussed in our new representation. Hopefully, one day, it will bring new stuff into Game Theory. And it should be able to prove that for all linear-probability-combination classical game and all linear-and-anti-linear-amplitude-combination quantum game, the new representation is always valid[6].

Acknowledgement — The authors want to thank Dr. Shouyong Pei and Zengru Di for their advices during the revision of this paper. This work is partial supported by China NSF 70371072 and 70371073.

References

[1] Jinshan Wu, A new mathematical representation of Game Theory, arXiv:quant-ph/0404159.

[2] J. Eisert, M. Wilkens, and M. Lewenstein, Quantum Games and Quantum Strategies, Phys. Rev. Lett, **83**(1999), 3077.

[3] D.A. Meyer, Quantum Strategies, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**(1999), 1052.

[4] M.A. Neilsen and I.L.Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, p20, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[5] Jinshan Wu, An artificial game with entangled equilibrium state, arXiv:quant-ph/0405003.

[6] Jinshan Wu, A new mathematical representation of Game Theory II, arXiv:quant-ph/0405183. Fortunately, in this paper, we have proved the conclusion that the linear property guarantees our abstract representation is generally valid.